



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,718	04/21/2004	David A. Hill	030728 (BLL-0181)	4760
36192	7590	11/25/2008		
AT&T Legal Department				
Attn: Patent Docketing				
Room 2A-207				
One AT&T Way				
Bedminster, NJ 07921				
EXAMINER				
PHAM, MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,718

Applicant(s)

HILL, DAVID A.

Examiner

MICHAEL PHAM

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Pre-Appeal Brief filed on 7/16/08, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167.

Claim Status

2. Claims 1-20 are pending.
3. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 16 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 16 and 17 appear as though they should be dependent to claim 11 and not 1. Appropriate correction is required. In order to expedite and advance prosecution, claim 16 and 17 will be treated as such.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. Regarding claim 10 this claim recites a 'storage medium.' In the absence of any modifying disclosure of this limitation in the specification, the examiner interprets the term 'storage medium' as excluding printed paper, transmission media, signals, or any form of energy, such that the claim clearly falls within a statutory class of invention as required under the terms of 35 U.S.C. 101.

6. Regarding claim 11 these claims recite a 'server.' In the absence of any modifying disclosure of this limitation in the specification, the examiner interprets the term 'server' as limited to at least containing hardware embodiments, such that the claim clearly falls within a statutory class of invention as required under the terms of 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1- 2, 5-7, 10-12, 15-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6208345 by Sheard et. al. (hereafter Sheard).

Claim 1 :

Sheard discloses the following claimed limitations:

“converting data in a service request into an open data format resulting in a converted service request;”[figure 1, col. 12 lines 8-10, data streams produced by information provider 1 is control or request information which is further processed by the data exchange infrastructure. Col. 8 lines 18-21, the adapter 34a reformulates the informational content 'A' into a common or generic form which is subsequently operated on by the data exchange infrastructure 32. col. 8 lines 25-32, Assuming that Application 2 requires selected informational content 'A' produced by application 1, the data exchange infrastructure 32 facilitates the transport of the content 'A' information to adapter 34b associated with application 2. The adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Accordingly, converting data (format A) in a service request (request) into an open data format (common format) resulting in a converted service (format B).]

“validating the converted service request utilizing user-defined business logic, the validating including:”[col. 12 lines 30-39, an application running within the system environment operated by information provider 2 may require data that is derived through computation or manipulation from data streams B1 and C1 produced by corresponding applications running within the system environment operated by information provider 1. The data exchange operates on the data streams B1 and C1 in the manner dictated by user-specified business logic stored in the business logic module. Col. 13 lines 15-20, business logic provides for enhanced scalability,

expandability, and flexibility to meet current and future information exchange requirements. Accordingly, disclosing validating (meet current and future information exchange requirements) the converted service request (operates on the data streams B1 and C1) utilizing user-defined business logic (user-specified business logic).]

“performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request; and”[col. 14 lines 49-52, if the data is considered corrupt, an error in the data packet received from the external source is verified, and, in response, is removed or deleted for purposes of further processing. Accordingly, performing accuracy checks (verified) of data fields (data packet) and data (data) within the converted service request (request).]

“performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request;”[col. 14 lines 60-65, if the transaction is not successful a rollback of the transaction is then initiated. If the transaction is successful, the data packet from the external data source is then removed or deleted. The above-described process is then repeated for subsequent data packets received from the external source. Accordingly, performing consistency checks (if transaction successful) of data (data) and data fields (data packet) within the converted service request (request).]

“resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request;”[Figure 12, Accordingly, resolving any errors (338, error) and

inconsistencies (350, system failure) detected from the validating (336 and 350) resulting in a validated service request (figure 12)]

“generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application; and”[col. 14 lines 32-34, after the business rules have been applied, requests to one or more destination OSS applications are then routed to a corresponding send queue 242, 244, 246 for delivery. Accordingly, generating a service order (delivery) using the validated service request (figure 12), the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application (col. 14 lines 38-43, requested information represented in common object form to a format structure specified by the particular OSS. The converted data is then transmitted from the application interface of the adaptor to its corresponding OSS)]

“transmitting the service order to the service order control application;”[col. 14 lines 38-43, the converted data is then transmitted from the application interface of the adaptor to its corresponding OSS. Accordingly, transmitting the service order to the service order control application (transmitted...to corresponding OSS)]

“wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes:

converting the converted service request back to its original data format; and”[col. 8 lines 30-32, the adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Figure 12

element 350 and 352. Accordingly, wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes converting the converted service request back to its original data format (rollback)]

“transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source.”[col. 8 lines 30-32, the adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Figure 12, data from external source. Accordingly, transmitting the service request in its original data format (Format B) back to a corresponding service request source (external source)]

Claim 2 :

Sheard discloses “modifying the user-defined business logic to accommodate at least one of:”

“a new or modified service offered;”

“a new or modified product offered; and”

“a new or modified business requirement” [col. 13 lines 17-20, business logic provides for enhanced scalability, expandability, and flexibility to meet current and future information exchange requirements].

Claim 5 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the resolving errors and inconsistencies includes performing at least one of:

flagging the converted service request for correction; and”

“notifying the corresponding service request source of corrective action

to be taken.” [figure 12 element 336 and 350]

Claim 6 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the resolving errors and inconsistencies includes quering an external source of information.”[figure 12 element 332]

Claim 7 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the external source of information includes at least one of:

“a central office service resource storing available service offerings;” [col. 9 line 9, telecommunications services, information provider 1 and 2]

“a customer facilities resource operable for validating customer facilities, the customer facilities resource including at least one of:

a loop maintenance operations system;”

“a trunk inventory records keeping system; and”

“a loop facilities assignment and control system;”

“an address guide operable for performing address validation, the address guide storing street address information;”

“a telephone number resource operable for storing telephone numbers that are available for reservation and assignment to customers; and”

“a customer service records resource operable for obtaining customer service record information.”

Claim 10 :

Sheard discloses the following claimed limitations:

“converting data in a service request into an open data format resulting in a converted service request;” [figure 1, col. 12 lines 8-10, data streams produced by information provider 1 is control or request information which is further processed by the data exchange infrastructure. Col. 8 lines 18-21, the adapter 34a reformulates the informational content 'A' into a common or generic form which is subsequently operated on by the data exchange infrastructure 32. col. 8 lines 25-32, Assuming that Application 2 requires selected informational content 'A' produced by application 1, the data exchange infrastructure 32 facilitates the transport of the content 'A' information to adapter 34b associated with application 2. The adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Accordingly, converting data (format A) in a service request (request) into an open data format (common format) resulting in a converted service request (format B).]

“validating the converted service request utilizing user-defined business logic, the validating including;” [col. 12 lines 30-39, an application running within the system environment operated by information provider 2 may require data that is derived through computation or manipulation from data streams B1 and C1 produced by corresponding applications running within the system environment operated by information provider 1. The data exchange operates

on the data streams B1 and C1 in the manner dictated by user-specified business logic stored in the business logic module. Col. 13 lines 15-20, business logic provides for enhanced scalability, expandability, and flexibility to meet current and future information exchange requirements. Accordingly, disclosing validating (meet current and future information exchange requirements) the converted service request (operates on the data streams B1 and C1) utilizing user-defined business logic (user-specified business logic).]

“performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request; and” [col. 14 lines 49-52, if the data is considered corrupt, an error in the data packet received from the external source is verified, and, in response, is removed or deleted for purposes of further processing. Accordingly, performing accuracy checks (verified) of data fields (data packet) and data (data) within the converted service request (request).]

“performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request;” [col. 14 lines 60-65, if the transaction is not successful a rollback of the transaction is then initiated. If the transaction is successful, the data packet from the external data source is then removed or deleted. The above-described process is then repeated for subsequent data packets received from the external source. Accordingly, performing consistency checks (if transaction successful) of data (data) and data fields (data packet) within the converted service request (request).]

“resolving may errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request;” [Figure 12, Accordingly, resolving any errors (338, error) and inconsistencies (350, system failure) detected from the validating (336 and 350) resulting in a validated service request (figure 12)]

“generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application; and” [col. 14 lines 32-34, after the business rules have been applied, requests to one or more destination OSS applications are then routed to a corresponding send queue 242, 244, 246 for delivery. Accordingly, generating a service order (delivery) using the validated service request (figure 12), the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application (col. 14 lines 38-43, requested information represented in common object form to a format structure specified by the particular OSS. The converted data is then transmitted from the application interface of the adaptor to its corresponding OSS)]

“transmitting the service order to the service order control application;” [col. 14 lines 38-43, the converted data is then transmitted from the application interface of the adaptor to its corresponding OSS. Accordingly, transmitting the service order to the service order control application (transmitted...to corresponding OSS)]

“wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format; and” [col. 8 lines 30-32, the adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Figure 12 element 350 and 352. Accordingly, wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes converting the converted service request back to its original data format (rollback)]

“transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source.” [col. 8 lines 30-32, the adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible

with application 2. Figure 12, data from external source. Accordingly, transmitting the service request in its original data format (Format B) back to a corresponding service request source (external source)]

Claim 11:

Sheard discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a server executing a service order control application;”[figure 1, 3, 7]

“a data repository in communication with the server;”[figure 3 element 64]

“a service order generator executing on the server, the service order generator including:

 a service request normalizer;”[figure 3, adapters]

 “a roles engine comprising:

 a field validation module; and”[figure 7 element 172]

 “a custom service validation module; and”[figure 7 element 136]

 “a service order writer;”[figure 7 element 138]

 “a link to at least one service request source;”[figure 1 140 and 152]

“wherein the service order generator performs:

converting data in a service request received from the at least one service order source into an open data format resulting in a converted service request;” [figure 1, col. 12 lines 8-10, data streams produced by information provider 1 is control or request information which is further processed by the data exchange infrastructure. Col. 8 lines 18-21, the adapter 34a reformulates the informational content 'A' into a common or generic form which is subsequently operated on

by the data exchange infrastructure 32. col. 8 lines 25-32, Assuming that Application 2 requires selected informational content 'A' produced by application 1, the data exchange infrastructure 32 facilitates the transport of the content 'A' information to adapter 34b associated with application 2. The adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Accordingly, wherein the service order generator (figure 1, 3, 7) performs: converting data (format A) in a service request (request) into an open data format (common format) resulting in a converted service request (format B).]

“validating the converted service request utilizing user-defined business logic, the validating including:” [col. 12 lines 30-39, an application running within the system environment operated by information provider 2 may require data that is derived through computation or manipulation from data streams B1 and C1 produced by corresponding applications running within the system environment operated by information provider 1. The data exchange operates on the data streams B1 and C1 in the manner dictated by user-specified business logic stored in the business logic module. Col. 13 lines 15-20, business logic provides for enhanced scalability, expandability, and flexibility to meet current and future information exchange requirements. Accordingly, disclosing validating (meet current and future information exchange requirements) the converted service request (operates on the data streams B1 and C1) utilizing user-defined business logic (user-specified business logic).]

“performing accuracy checks of data fields and data within the converted service request; and”

[col. 14 lines 49-52, if the data is considered corrupt, an error in the data packet received from the external source is verified, and, in response, is removed or deleted for purposes of further processing. Accordingly, performing accuracy checks (verified) of data fields (data packet) and data (data) within the converted service request (request).]

“performing consistency checks of data and data fields within the converted service request;” [col. 14 lines 60-65, if the transaction is not successful a rollback of the transaction is then initiated. If the transaction is successful, the data packet from the external data source is then removed or deleted. The above-described process is then repeated for subsequent data packets received from the external source. Accordingly, performing consistency checks (if transaction successful) of data (data) and data fields (data packet) within the converted service request (request).]

“resolving any errors and inconsistencies detected from the validating resulting in a validated service request;” [Figure 12, Accordingly, resolving any errors (338, error) and inconsistencies (350, system failure) detected from the validating (336 and 350) resulting in a validated service request (figure 12)]

“generating a service order using the validated service request, the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application; and” [col. 14 lines 32-34, after the business rules have been applied, requests to one or more destination OSS applications are then routed to a corresponding send queue 242, 244, 246 for delivery. Accordingly, generating a service order (delivery) using the validated service request (figure 12), the service order formatted to comply with formatting utilized by a service order control application (col. 14 lines 38-43, requested information represented in common object form to a

format structure specified by the particular OSS. The converted data is then transmitted from the application interface of the adaptor to its corresponding OSS)]

“transmitting the service order to the service order control application;” [col. 14 lines 38-43, the converted data is then transmitted from the application interface of the adaptor to its corresponding OSS. Accordingly, transmitting the service order to the service order control application (transmitted...to corresponding OSS)]

“wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes: converting the converted service request back to its original data format; and” [col. 8 lines 30-32, the adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Figure 12 element 350 and 352. Accordingly, wherein resolving any errors and inconsistencies includes converting the converted service request back to its original data format (rollback)]

“transmitting the service request in its original data format back to a corresponding service request source.” [col. 8 lines 30-32, the adaptor 34b reformulates the informational content 'A' having a common representation to a format 'B' representation which is compatible with application 2. Figure 12, data from external source. Accordingly, transmitting the service request in its original data format (Format B) back to a corresponding service request source (external source)]

Claim 12 :

Sheard discloses wherein the user-defined business logic is modified to accommodate at least one of:

a new or modified service offered;
a new or modified product offered; and
a new or modified business requirement [col. 13 lines 17-20, business logic provides for enhanced scalability, expandability, and flexibility to meet current and future information exchange requirements].

Claim 15 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the resolving errors and inconsistencies includes performing at least one of: flagging the converted service request for correction; and”
“notifying the corresponding service request source of corrective action to be taken.” [figure 12 element 336 and 350]

Claim 16 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the resolving errors and inconsistencies includes querying an external source of information.”[figure 12 element 332]

Claim 17 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the external source of information includes at least one of:

“a central office service resource storing available service offerings;” [col. 9 line 9, telecommunications services, information provider 1 and 2]

“a customer facilities resource operable for validating customer facilities, the customer facilities resource including at least one of:

a loop maintenance operations system;”

“a trunk inventory records keeping system; and”

“a loop facilities assignment and control system;”

“an address guide operable for performing address validation, the address guide storing street address information;”

“a telephone number resource operable for storing telephone numbers that are available for reservation and assignment to customers; and”

“a customer service records resource operable for obtaining customer service record information.”

Claim 20 :

Sheard discloses “wherein the service requests are stored in a queue.” [See figure 8]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-4, 8, 13-14, and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6208345 by Sheard et. al. (hereafter Sheard). further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0061062 by Timothy J. Tucker (hereafter Tucker).

Claim 3 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose

“checking for missing data in the data fields;”

“checking for incomplete data in the data fields; and”

“checking for data format errors.”

On the other hand, Tucker more explicitly discloses

“checking for missing data in the data fields;” [0044 and 0045, data may be checked for completeness]

“checking for incomplete data in the data fields; and”[0044 and 0045, data may be checked for completeness]

“checking for data format errors.” [0044 and 0045, data may be checked for completeness]

Both Sheard and Tucker disclose systems that provide transformation services, and further disclose verifying the data. They are therefore within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the disclosure of Tucker to the disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of checking for completeness, and verifying that the required fields are present, 0045.

Claim 4 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose “checking a first data field within the converted service request against subsequent data fields within the converted service request, wherein the first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields.”

On the other hand, Tucker discloses 0045, discloses checks for completeness may include verifying that the required fields are present or other check as required. Accordingly, checking a first data field (required fields) within the converted service request (validate) against subsequent data fields (fields are present) within the converted service request (validate), wherein the first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields (verifying that the required fields are present)

Both Sheard and Tucker disclose systems that provide transformation services, and further disclose verifying the data. They are therefore within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the disclosure of Tucker to the disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of checking for completeness, and verifying that the required fields are present, 0045.

Claim 8 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose “wherein the open data format includes extensible markup language.”

On the other hand, Tucker discloses 0044, the transformation engine may use XML and XSL and/or other methods of conversion. Accordingly, wherein the open data format includes extensible markup language (XML).

Both Sheard and Tucker disclose systems that provide transformation services, and further disclose verifying the data. They are therefore within the same field of endeavor as applicant’s invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the disclosure of Tucker to the disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of sharing data in an extensible format.

Claim 13 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose
“checking for missing data in the data fields;”
“checking for incomplete data in the data fields; and”
“checking for data format errors.”

On the other hand, Tucker more explicitly discloses
“checking for missing data in the data fields;” [0044 and 0045, data may be checked for completeness]

“checking for incomplete data in the data fields; and”[0044 and 0045, data may be checked for completeness]

“checking for data format errors.” [0044 and 0045, data may be checked for completeness]

Both Sheard and Tucker disclose systems that provide transformation services, and further disclose verifying the data. They are therefore within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the disclosure of Tucker to the disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of checking for completeness, and verifying that the required fields are present, 0045.

Claim 14 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose “checking a first data field within the converted service request against subsequent data fields within the converted service request, wherein the first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields.”

On the other hand, Tucker discloses 0045, discloses checks for completeness may include verifying that the required fields are present or other check as required. Accordingly, checking a first data field (required fields) within the converted service request (validate) against subsequent data fields (fields are present) within the converted service request (validate), wherein the first data field holds data corresponding to data held in at least one of the subsequent data fields (verifying that the required fields are present)

Both Sheard and Tucker disclose systems that provide transformation services, and further disclose verifying the data. They are therefore within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the disclosure of Tucker to the disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of checking for completeness, and verifying that the required fields are present, 0045.

Claim 18 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose "wherein the open data format includes extensible markup language."

On the other hand, Tucker discloses 0044, the transformation engine may use XML and XSL and/or other methods of conversion. Accordingly, wherein the open data format includes extensible markup language (XML).

Both Sheard and Tucker disclose systems that provide transformation services, and further disclose verifying the data. They are therefore within the same field of endeavor as applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the disclosure of Tucker to the disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of sharing data in an extensible format.

11. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6208345 by Sheard et. al. (hereafter Sheard) further in view of U.S. Patent 6937993 by Gabbita et. al. (hereafter Gabbita).

Claim 9 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose

“querying a service scheduling resource to identify an available service date for performing a service requested in the validated service requested; and”

“including a selected service date in the service order.”

On the other hand, Gabbita discloses col. 9 lines 34-37, scheduling a service order or a supplement to a service order, involves identifying all of the activities required to complete the order, determining the order in which the activities should be completed, and specifying the required completion time for each activity. Col. 9 lines 45-55 customer due date specified in the order. Accordingly, querying a service scheduling resource (scheduling a service order) to identify (identifying) an available service date for performing a service requested in the validated service requested (col. 9 lines 23-25, planned start and finish times for each step using the customer delivery date.); and including a selected service date in the service order (required completion time).

Both Sheard and Gabbita are within applicant's same field of endeavor, as they both disclose telecommunication systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to have applied Gabbita's disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of tracking service orders.

Claim 19 :

Sheard does not explicitly disclose

“querying a service scheduling resource to identify an available service date for performing a service requested in the validated service requested; and”

“including a selected service date in the service order.”

On the other hand, Gabbita discloses col. 9 lines 34-37, scheduling a service order or a supplement to a service order, involves identifying all of the activities required to complete the order, determining the order in which the activities should be completed, and specifying the required completion time for each activity. Col. 9 lines 45-55 customer due date specified in the order. Accordingly, querying a service scheduling resource (scheduling a service order) to identify (identifying) an available service date for performing a service requested in the validated service requested (col. 9 lines 23-25, planned start and finish times for each step using the customer delivery date.); and including a selected service date in the service order (required completion time).

Both Sheard and Gabbita are within applicant's same field of endeavor, as they both disclose telecommunication systems. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to have applied Gabbita's disclosure above to the disclosure of Sheard for the purpose of tracking service orders.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record listed on pto-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2167